

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached "Replacement Sheets" of drawings include changes to Figures 3, 8 and 13. The attached "Replacement Sheets," which include Figures 1-17, replace the original sheets including Figures 1-17.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 10-14, 20, 22, and 23 are now pending in the application. Claim 25 has been cancelled. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Pursuant to the Examiner's request, copies of the photographs previously faxed with the Information Disclosure Statement of April 22, 2004 are attached at Tab A.

DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to for certain informalities. Applicants have attached revised drawings for the Examiner's approval. In the "Replacement Sheets," assembly lines have been added in exploded views of Figures 3, 8 and 13. In addition, spring "46" has been added in the exploded view of Figure 3.

SPECIFICATION

The specification stands objected to for certain informalities. Applicants have amended the specification according to the Examiner's suggestions. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 AND 103

Claims 1, 5-8, 10, 12, 13, 20, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Peterson (U.S. Pat. No. 3,105,530, hereinafter “Peterson”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 10, 11, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Curran (U.S. Pat. No. 3,606,718, hereinafter “Curran”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-4, 7, 10, 12-14, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Behne et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,736,042, hereinafter “Behne”) in view of Peterson. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 2, 14, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson as applied to claims 1, 13, and 22 above, and further in view of Akin (U.S. Pat. No. 2,731,049, hereinafter “Akin”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicants note that claims 1, 13, and 22 have been amended to include “a quick-release mechanism for providing selective engagement between said support structure and said entire hood assembly.” Applicants note that this feature was generally previously presented in dependent claim 3. While the Examiner has rejected claim 3 in view of the combination of Behne and Peterson, Applicants submit that this combination does not teach the limitations of currently amended claims 1, 13, and 22. The catch (355), considered a “quick-release” by the Examiner, merely provides removable attachment between the spreader plate (350), considered the “riving knife” by the Examiner, and the work table (30). Further, Applicants submit that the riving

knife is not part of the hood assembly, but rather part of the support structure. There is no teaching or suggestion in either of the references for the claimed quick-release mechanism providing selective engagement between the entire hood assembly and the support structure. As such, amended claims 1, 13, and 22 should currently be in condition for allowance.

Applicants further submit that claims 2, 14, and 23 specifically state "said support structure includes a riving knife." As such, there is clearly no teaching of the claimed quick-release providing selective engagement between the support structure (including the riving knife) and the entire hood assembly. Therefore, claims 2, 14, and 23 appear to provide additional reasons for allowance.

In view of the amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 13, and 22 are in condition for allowance. Claims 2, 4, 5-8, and 10 to 12 depend from claim 1, claims 14 and 20 depend from claim 13, and claim 23 depends from claim 22 and should therefore be in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-14, 20, 22, and 23.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt

and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 5-10-06

By: Ryan W. Massey
Ryan W. Massey, Reg. No. 38543

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

RWM/JMP/slgl
J:\HDP Forms\Client Forms\BlackDecker (0275_, 6736, 8913)\Amendment Form.dot